Mr. Lewis E. Kinard
P.O. Box 1047
Karnville, S.C. 29944

9/23/91

Dear Mr. Kinard,

I appreciate your concern over my health problems and I take time for a few indications. I had my first venous thrombosis in 1975, a left femoral bypass in 1980, followed by two emergency operations there, and aside from what in most people is minor surgery, cataract removal, TUR on the prostate and the removal of a couple of skin cancers I've also had open-heart surgery, three bypasses, and I'm 78. So you can see why I can't take time just for chitchat letters.

With regard to the person present at JFK's autopsy, I'll not even check the list of those there for identification. If that person wants confidentiality, he or she is entitled to it. However, it should be born in mind that the asking of questions sometimes can distort recollection, particularly after many years have passed, and if the questions are not absolutely correct then this danger is increased and the interviewee may therefter "remember" incorrectly. There are relevant instances. And only too often, particularly after reading the books theorizing "solutions," those who've read them, lacking detailed factual knowledge, believe what is not the case is actually accurate when it isn't.

This is reflected in your belief that Sibert and O'Neill left earlier than they did. They remained throughout the entire autopsy, until the body was given to the undertakers. Who, I believe, did more than embalm the body. I'm pretty sure there was extensive reconstruction, plus some comestic efforts, and these added materially to the embalming time.

There is nothing wrong or sinister in Kellerman's going for Clint Hill to be a witness to the wound location and it was, I think, the right thing to do. Hill was a member of the detail and a witness. If you recall what I wrote about this, what Kellerman did, aside from being good police proceedure, made an important evidentiary and historical record.

I do look forward to getting a transcript of the interview of the person present at the autopsy. May I suggest that the interviewer begin by asking this person first to say whatever comes to mind about it, without any questioning, and, assuming that the interview will be taped, as it should be, just restrict to encouraging undirected recollection. While this person is talking, notes of questions can be made, and after all the uninspired recollection is recorded, then ask questions.

There is a question I'd like asked, going back to the Sibert-O'Neill report and its reference to alleged surgery of the head: did Dr.Humes or anyone else ask the gallery if there had been surgery of the head. (And by this I do <u>not</u> mean where the skull was opened). I believe there was another reason for the prosectors to wonder about this.

Sincerely,

Harold

Harold Weisberg